DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 197 TM 005 154

AUTHOR Hanford, George H.
TITLE Minority Programs and Activities of the College Entrance Examination Board: A Critical Review and a Brief Look Ahead.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 71p.
AVAILABLE FROM College Entrance Examination Board, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 (Item No. 252 227, Free)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; *College Admission; College Entrance Examinations; *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Change; Educational Development; Educational Discrimination; Educational Needs; Educational Opportunities; *Equal Education; Financial Problems; Guidance Programs; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Predictive Validity; Secondary Education; Test Bias; *Testing Problems
IDENTIFIERS *College Entrance Examination Board

ABSTRACT

The College Entrance Examination Board's (CEEB) internal review of its efforts to develop and implement programs to expand educational opportunities for minorities and the poor revealed that the Board had not been as successful as it had hoped. Most of the Board's efforts to ensure equal access to higher education focused on guidance programs, test center desegregation, financial assistance, and test use. Although these programs benefited some, few changes occurred in CEEB's major testing programs. CEEB found that extensive validity studies confirmed the predictive validity of their tests despite accusations of bias. Massive aid, to the neediest first, was seen as the only method for improving the educational opportunities of the poor, as the Board's College Scholarship Service need-analysis system was inadequate. Suggestions for the future were presented in these areas: explicit activities that should be continued or undertaken; explicit needs to which the College Board should make pragmatic response; explicit activities that should be deemphasized; general activities in which minority interests should be kept in the forefront of staff thinking; and areas in which the College Board has a social responsibility to support the interests of minority youth. (BJG)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED120197

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

Minority Programs and Activities of the College Entrance Examination Board:

A Critical Review and a Brief Look Ahead

George H. Hanford

TM005 154

Minority Programs and Activities of the College Entrance Examination Board: A Critical Review and a Brief Look Ahead

George H. Hanford
Senior Vice President, Operations

College Entrance Examination Board, New York

Copies of this booklet can be ordered from
College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

Copyright © 1976 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

Contents

FOREWORD by S. P. Marland Jr. v

SYNOPSIS vii

INTRODUCTION 1
Demonstration Guidance Projects. 1
Desegregation of Test Centers. 2
Financial Barriers 3
Use of Tests 4
Complexity of Problem. 5
Summary. 6

FORUMS OF THE COLLEGE BOARD. 8
Types of Forums. 8
Composition of the Forums. 12
Board Staff as a Forum 13
For the Future 14

DEMONSTRATION GUIDANCE CENTERS 15
Examples of Demonstration Guidance Projects. 15
Outcomes 20
For the Future 22

FINANCIAL AID SERVICES 24

TESTING AND RELATED SERVICES 27
Fee Waivers. 27
Student Search Service 28
PSAT/NMSQT 29
Training Activities. 30
Minority Consulting Service. 32
Films and Publications 32
Minority Scholarship Programs. 33
Puerto Rican Activities. 34
Bilingual Education. 35

Minority-Related Research. 36
Bias in Relation to Tests. 37
ETS Guidelines for Testing Minorities. 42

ORGANIZING FOR THE FUTURE. 45
The HEAR Proposal. 45
The Conceptual Framework 46
A Future Focus for the College Board 51

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED ACTIONS FOR THE FUTURE. 57

BIBLIOGRAPHY 61

Foreword

In a speech at one of the College Board's regional meetings, John Monro, former Dean at Harvard and currently Dean of Freshman Studies at Miles College, spoke of the efforts the Board has made to be responsive to the needs of minority youth. He characterized the organization as one having "good intentions." He was correct.

Its good intentions have been and are reflected in a number of special activities, publications, and programs. These efforts have been intensified during the past several years. This year, as part of its 75th anniversary observance, the College Board is reviewing and evaluating its role and mission. Accordingly, it is appropriate to review and evaluate our special efforts to be responsive to the special needs of minority youth. As the first step in this process, George H. Hanford, Senior Vice President, Operations, was commissioned to bring together in a single volume the record of these special efforts, to assess them candidly, and to point the way for addressing what still needs to be done.

Mr. Hanford's work has resulted in this report which describes in some detail the College Board's substantial investment in funds and talent to advance the cause of equality of educational opportunity for minority youth. Although these efforts have met with varying degrees of success, the record suggests it would be useful for the larger educational community as well as our membership to be apprised of what has been attempted and with what success. It seems to us that of even more importance is the

contemplation of the future and the unfinished business that lies in that direction for the College Board.

Mr. Hanford has provided a synopsis of his report at the beginning and a carefully prepared summary of suggested actions for the future at the end. These sections, along with the introduction, will be especially useful to those hard-pressed for time, but for readers deeply interested in the subject, they will only whet the appetite for the full document.

Mr. Hanford is eminently well qualified to undertake this task. As the senior officer, both in point of service and scope of operational responsibilities, he has participated in all of the decisions to launch the efforts of the College Board to be responsive to the needs of minority students and has carried the major responsibility for monitoring their implementation. His leadership and initiative will be welcomed by all of us in the Board as we go forward from here in the pursuit of the overarching goal of equal educational opportunity for all.

S. P. Marland Jr.
President

Synopsis

The College Board's concern for the nation's minorities and the poor was first explicitly expressed in the mid- and late 1950s through its participation in New York City's Demonstration Guidance Project and through its efforts to desegregate test centers. As the civil rights movement gained momentum in the early 1960s, attention came to be focused more and more on the use of tests and test scores with minority students in the college admissions process and on minority students' need for financial aid dollars. In these beginnings can be seen the roots of the problems facing minority youth in achieving access to postsecondary education and the bases for the responses that the College Board has made to them.

Through its sponsorship of a series of later efforts similar to the Demonstration Guidance Project (such as Project Access, Project Open, Project Opportunity, and the Education Assistance Center), the College Board confirmed the findings of other similar projects: An infusion of dollars, time, and interest can overcome educational disadvantage, reduce the drop-out rate, increase performance levels, increase the graduation rate, and increase the numbers of minority students going on to higher education. Although the pay-off in human terms of the special projects may have been satisfying, the pay-off in changes in the Board's major testing programs (except for the institution of fee waivers) has been less than had been hoped for. Validity studies by the score and special studies by the dozen have confirmed the predictive validity of the College Board's

basic test instruments, although charges of bias do persist in relation to the use of tests, the criteria against which they are validated, their reliability for non-white test takers and their Waspish language. As for College Board financial aid services, it is clear now that no amount of manipulation of the College Scholarship Service need-analysis system will improve the opportunities of the poor; only a massive increase in aid dollars, accompanied by adherence to the principle of aid to the neediest first, can do that. Research in the College Board's on-going programs to meet minority needs must continue, but real progress might possibly break out on another front.

Since the late 1950s the College Board has continued to integrate not just its test centers but its councils and staffs, moving groups and individuals from responsibilities focusing initially on minority concerns to ones affecting minority and majority students alike. Minority representation on staff becomes particularly important as the College Board seeks to respond on behalf of its institutional constituency to the growing interest on the part of the nation's youth in career opportunities. If all the College Board's efforts on behalf of minority students have thus far yielded such little return in terms of its traditional, on-going programs, the real hope may well lie in the new dimensions of human assessment that are implicit in career education and other newly emerging concepts. This then is where the College Board should put its emphasis.

Introduction

The College Entrance Examination Board is observing during 1975 the 75th anniversary of its founding. As a major part of the observance, the College Board is reviewing its role and mission, and an important part of this review involves its efforts on behalf of minority youth. The decline in 1974 of the percentage of college freshmen who are black added an element of urgency to the need for a review of these efforts. This report is a review of what the College Board, on its own and in cooperation with Educational Testing Service (ETS), has done and an assessment of what still needs to be done to help minority youth to enjoy equal access to postsecondary education.

DEMONSTRATION GUIDANCE PROJECTS

The impetus for involvement came from the 1954 Supreme Court decision involving Brown v. Board of Education in Topeka, Kansas. The College Board's first explicit response occurred in 1956 when S. A. Kendrick, then Vice President, Examination and Research, engaged the association in the Demonstration Guidance Project. Launched at Junior High School 43 by the New York City Board of Education in cooperation with the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students and the College Board, "Project 43," as it was familiarly known, "was created to demonstrate that the culturally deprived population of a large city could, under vastly increased but still practical school direction, produce a great many more talented and educable

adults than they do now."[1] Kendrick put the project in perspective this way: "For the College Board, the Project is a necessary complement to the Advanced Placement Program. If the needs of the plainly gifted must be met--and they must--so must encrusted talent be wrenched from the environment that will not let it emerge. Whether they will or not, pupils whose tastes are gross when they could be fine, whose accomplishments are mean when they could be large, and whose ability to choose a future for themselves is restricted by an ignorance of the variety of the world, must be given what they will not demand."[2]

Project 43 was followed by Project Opportunity, Project Access, Project Open, and a host of other demonstration projects in which the College Board played a significant role. All of these confirmed that the levels of performance and aspiration of minority/poverty youth can be improved by infusions of time, effort, and concern; none, however, provided the catalyst for generating changes in the College Board's basic programs for which all had earnestly hoped.

DESEGREGATION OF TEST CENTERS

The College Board's initial operational response to the court's call for racial integration of education was a five-year effort to desegregate its test centers in the South. Undertaken at the suggestion of then ETS President Henry Chauncey at a meeting of the College Board Trustees in December 1960, the task was accomplished quickly but effectively by the College Board's Southern Regional Office staff under a Trustee policy adopted three months later that stated that "the first responsibility of the College Entrance Examination Board is to provide for the testing of all candidates under standard, equitable conditions." A later elaboration in 1962 declared, "Conditions cannot be considered 'standard' or 'equitable' if any discrimination against a candidate within a testing center is made on the basis of race, color, or national origin." By 1965 the process had been completed, and the Special Committee on Examining Center Policy appointed in 1962 to oversee it was discharged.

1. S. A. Kendrick, "In Search of 'Non-Existent' Talent," College Board Review, No. 34, p. 4.
2. Kendrick, op. cit., p. 6.

This chapter of history appeared closed until the Annual Meeting of the members of the College Entrance Examination Board in October 1970, when the following resolution to relocate test centers in areas not hostile to minority students was adopted.

"Whereas, the geographical locations of the College Entrance Examination Board testing centers for administering the SAT and Achievement Tests are located in extremely hostile areas of predominantly or formerly predominantly white communities, which constitutes a barrier of access for minority groups:

"Be it resolved: That this assembly of the College Entrance Examination Board go on record as recommending to Educational Testing Service that, in the selection of testing centers for the purpose of administering the SAT and Achievement Tests, consideration be given to the designation of sites in geographical areas that are most relaxed and non-hostile to minority groups, and that can facilitate, will accept, and are convenient to the mass majority of minority group students directly involved in taking the SAT and Achievement Tests."

A brief description of the work of the Committee on Hostile Test Center Environment, established in response to this recommendation, and of progress in this area to date is included in this report on page 41.

FINANCIAL BARRIERS

It was at the College Board's Seventh Colloquium on College Admissions that the Board's spotlight was first focused on, among other problems, the financial barriers to higher education faced by "tens of thousands of able children whose only fault is that they are poor, or a wrong color."[3] Speaking on the subject, "Who Should Get What Aid From the Colleges," Rexford G. Moon Jr., said, "Talent loss is an evil; an evil which money is the root of." Citing a then-recent study made by Elmo Roper, he observed that "financial reasons are given as the most likely major deterrent to college attendance by those of low economic status."[4]

3. John Monro, "Foreword," in The Search for Talent. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1960, p. v.
4. Rexford G. Moon Jr., "Who Should Get What Aid From the Colleges?" in The Search for Talent. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1960, p. 101.

Ten years later at a colloquium on barriers to higher education sponsored by the College Board "as part of its continuing effort to help eliminate the enormous deficit in the number of minority/poverty youth who go on for higher education,"[5] Humphrey Doermann, writing on "Lack of Money: A Barrier to Higher Education," noted, "Even though the amount of money available to college students has increased dramatically in the last ten years, and even though an increasing percentage of our high school graduates--from all races and all income levels-- now goes on to college, it still remains true that lack of sufficient financial support remains one of the major barriers to higher education in the United States. Students who could and should benefit from education after high school are prevented from doing so because they lack the money."[6]

USE OF TESTS

As the civil rights movement gained momentum in the early 1960s, attention became focused more and more on the use or misuse of tests and test scores with minority students in the college admissions process. Kendrick had anticipated the problem when in 1958 he wrote, "It is well known that conventional psychological tests have cultural bias."[7] By 1965 the College Board felt compelled to issue a statement on the subject. Its second paragraph starts, "It must be acknowledged that research findings relevant to this problem are fragmentary and, in some cases, ambiguous. Additional research is in progress and more is planned, but many of the questions will be answered only after long study."[8] Now, ten years later, much research has been done and some needed changes have been made. In general, research has confirmed that the tests provide accurate, though not infallible, assessments of the abilities of both minority and nonminority students, but the charge of test bias persists. No matter how much

5. Stephen J. Wright, "Foreword," in Barriers to Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971, p. v.
6. Humphrey Doermann, "Lack of Money: A Barrier to Higher Education," in Barriers to Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971, p. 130.
7. Kendrick, op. cit., p. 4.
8. Interpreting the SAT Scores of Educationally Disadvantaged Students. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965, p. 3.

psychometric "proof" is presented to refute the charge of bias, the problem will persist as long as the tests are perceived as biased.

COMPLEXITY OF PROBLEM

In the four "beginnings" cited above--guidance programs, desegregation of test centers, and the focus on financial aid problems and test use--can be seen the roots of the problems facing minority youth in achieving access to postsecondary education and the bases for the responses that the College Board has made to those problems. In the latter-day developments identified with each can be seen something of the educational and social dilemmas that have complicated and continue to complicate the process of response for the College Board.

Deep-rooted cultural, educational, and economic disadvantages constitute formidable barriers to postsecondary education for most of the nation's minority youth. True equality of access can be achieved only by the integration of social and cultural differences among the majority and minorities alike, by the provision of equal educational opportunities at the primary and secondary school levels, and by the removal of the economic barriers to college study. Compared to these goals, the College Board's actions may narrowly be perceived as treatments of the symptoms rather than as cures for the disease. However, they have with varying degrees of success served the process of diagnosis and pointed the direction if not the route to a cure.

The test center issue, for example, is a symptom of a fundamental social question. Should minorities be treated on an integrated or a separate-but-equal basis? Like other agencies in our society, the College Board has sought to respond in ways that are consistent with the intent of the 1954 Supreme Court decision and yet sensitive to the struggle within minority communities to achieve a sense of identity. This question has surfaced in other contexts, too--in calls for moratoriums on tests for minority youth or for special tests, for preferred treatment in the college admissions process, for tests in black history, and for College Board staff members specializing in minority affairs as well as for minority staff members specializing in aspects of College Board affairs. The College Board must continue to strive to maintain that uneasy balance between consistency and sensitivity and to seek to respond to the special needs of the nation's

minorities in ways that will bring them ultimately into the mainstream of American life.

At the heart of the debate over test bias is a complex of other interrelated social issues with educational emphases. Should there be diversity or homogeneity in higher education? Should students be chosen or changed to fit higher education institutions, or should admission be open and institutions forced to change to accommodate their students? The College Board should continue to attempt to provide services that will serve both selective and open admissions, both individual and institutional differences, and that will demonstrate the degrees of accommodation that need to be made by both.

Nowhere has the College Board been caught in more conflicting crosscurrents than in the financial aid area. As with the question of test bias, the continuing problem has been to achieve a proper balance among the conflicting ideologies of those who would argue for college admission according to merit, for proportionate representation of minorities within each student body, and for totally open access to postsecondary education. Today that search is complicated by the rising costs of and charges for higher education. But in this regard at least, there is a principle approved by the members of the College Scholarship Service Assembly and contained in the Parents' Confidential Statement that should continue to guide the College Board's efforts: "In the assignment of funds to those students designated to receive financial aid, the largest amounts of total grant assistance should go to students with the least ability to pay." Granted that principle, however, equality of access to higher education will not be achieved either for the minorities or the majority until massive increases in student financial aid are available.

SUMMARY

It can be seen that the College Board's response to the basic social issues has taken essentially four forms or, more properly, has taken place in four arenas--its forums, the demonstration projects in which it has participated, its testing programs, and its financial aid services. The body of this report deals with these four arenas, with what has been done and with what remains to be done in each, and with the task of reorganizing the College Board's effort both conceptually and procedurally in behalf of the

search for equality of access to postsecondary education. Fortunately, in this last regard the time is ripe. President Sidney P. Marland has given a new organizing principle to the College Board in the concept of career education, a concept which, according to one leading black educator, "holds greater promise for Black students to attain a good education and preparation for interesting and constructive careers than any civil rights acts [or] Supreme Court decisions."[9]

9. Lawrence F. Davenport, "Career Education and the Black Student," in Essays on Career Education. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in cooperation with U.S. Office of Education/National Institute of Education, April 1973, p. 177.

Forums of the College Board

The College Entrance Examination Board has traditionally served as a forum for the identification of problems of access to higher education and for the development of solutions to those problems. Frequently this development of solutions results in new programs or services which come to be perceived in time as ends in themselves. In fact, however, they remain the products and servants of the forums of the College Board. As in general, so in the specific case of the Board's activities and services on behalf of minority students, they have been developed as products of deliberations within the councils of the College Board.

TYPES OF FORUMS

These forums take a variety of forms--national and regional meetings of the members, councils and committees, workshops and colloquia, articles and publications. The first concentrated deliberations appear to have taken place at the College Board's Seventh Colloquium on College Admissions at Arden House in the fall of 1959. In a very real sense the papers of that colloquium, published under the title The Search for Talent, served quietly to presage problems that would be actively affecting secondary and higher education only a few years later.

Colloquium director John Monro, then Dean of Harvard College and Dean of Freshman Studies at Miles College since 1968, reviewing those papers in his Foreword made the following points. On test bias: "Testing for intelligence, aptitude, and achievement is central to our effort to find and encourage able students anywhere. Yet it is painfully clear that we do not

know much yet about measuring human ability . . . that the tests we now use often have a cultural bias, favoring the right student from the right side." On improving education and guidance in the schools: "We know now . . . that every school system has the power to discover its able students, to strengthen their interest in academic work, and to provide them a rich cultural background for college or for life." He lists "other hard kinks we must work out--the insidious effects of prejudice in our minds, the deep fear of some college people that increasing the numbers going to college from poor families and poor schools must lower the quality of higher education, the sticky conservatism of college scholarship committees when it comes to taking chances, or making large awards to the very needy boy or girl."[10]

Although the emphasis at this colloquium was, as noted above, on "able students everywhere," the seeds of concern for educationally disadvantaged students were sown. Stimulated by references at the colloquium to the experience of Project 43, these seeds bore fruit in a variety of later Board forums that are described in the paragraphs that follow.

The formal statement of College Board policy governing its activities relating to minority/poverty students issued in 1970, for example, was hammered out in committee. Entitled a "Conceptual Framework for the College Entrance Examination Board's Program in the Minority/Poverty Area," it was prepared with the advice and concurrence of an Advisory Panel on Minority Problems, a specialized, ad hoc forum comprised of individuals from the nation's largest minority communities, which had been convened to advise the officers of the College Board about its activities on behalf of the ethnic groups represented. Approved by the Board of Trustees in September 1970, this statement provides careful definition of what the College Board accepts as its role, objectives, and responsibilities in assisting minority/poverty students to become appropriately represented in the colleges and to increase significantly their chances of completing the programs they enter. The Conceptual Framework is discussed extensively beginning on page 46 of this report.

Forum deliberations led also to the generation of specific activities. For instance, conversations stimulated by a still-concerned John Monro in and around a Board of Trustees' meeting in New Orleans in December 1963

10. John Monro, op. cit., pp. v-viii.

led ultimately to the initiation of Project Opportunity. Discussed more fully later in this report, it was a cooperative effort on the part of certain southern schools and colleges to increase the number of black students going on to college and represents the most ambitious and extended demonstration project in which the College Board has been involved. In another context, as noted earlier, concerns about test-center conditions led first at a Trustees' meeting to the decision to desegregate and then later at an Annual Business Meeting to a resolution to minimize the number of test center locations hostile or inconvenient to minority youth.

A regional meeting in California in 1969 provided the setting for a group of Mexican American students to voice their concerns about discrimination in the college admission and entrance testing process. The same concerns were the subject of Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect, a book by Thomas Carter of the University of Texas at El Paso and published by the College Board in 1970.

A colloquium on financing equal opportunity in higher education was convened in 1970. On the last day of that event a resolution that had been presented and discussed the evening before was adopted by the participants:

"The assembled body, in recognition of the need for a workable program of massive financial aid to higher education for minority-group populations and also recognizing the need for direct input of information into that program from those minority-group populations who will be most directly affected by the program, does hereby approve and endorse the commission of a panel of representatives of Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, and Indian communities by the College Scholarship Service.

"This panel will be charged with the task of producing a document identifying the needs of these minority groups and containing a workable program for implementing massive financial aid to higher education for said groups that are sensitive to these needs. This document will be disseminated to the higher education community by the College Scholarship Service and to the appropriate bodies which are empowered to implement this program. The panel should be convened as quickly as possible and should attempt to complete its task within ninety days."[11]

11. W. Bradford Craig, "Report of the Colloquium Director," in Financing Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970, p. 38.

In accordance with that recommendation the Panel on Financing Low-Income and Minority Students in Higher Education was convened some five months later and after several meetings published its report, Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education, in 1973. The panel's recommendations were, however, public knowledge before passage of the Education Amendments of 1972, and its deliberations were undoubtedly taken into account in the conceptualization of the Basic Grants Program.

Throughout the years the College Board has sponsored a series of workshops and training sessions designed to assist minority administrators in dealing with the special problems of minority youth. In the late 1960s, for instance, the Board sponsored a training program for financial aid officers in the South and Southwest in cooperation with the Texas Association of Developing Colleges. More recently two institutes conducted for Mexican Americans had as their initial purpose increasing the number of competent financial aid officers among Mexican Americans.

In "A Ten-Year (1961-1971) Inventory of College Board Activities Aimed at Serving Minority/Poverty Youth and Their Access to Higher Educational Opportunity," Bernard P. Ireland points out more generally, "The subjects of talent searching, equality of access to higher education, and more recently, the specific problems minority/poverty students face in finding appropriate places in higher education have been included in the major forums sponsored by the College Board. For example, the Annual Meetings of the Board in 1967 and 1968 devoted major attention to the issue in the President's Report to the membership. In 1967, a major address to the Meeting was given by Mr. Kendrick on the representation of black students in higher education, and the 1968 Meeting featured a special interest session devoted to the topic of the Black Agenda. It should also be noted that the regional meetings sponsored by the Board have dealt with this topic. Moreover, the regional offices have held numerous special conferences with guidance and admissions officers and with representatives of social agencies to discuss the issues related to the recruitment, financial aid needs, and admissions practices of colleges and universities related to minority/poverty applicants."

Perhaps the most comprehensive forum response in this critical area was the colloquium on barriers to higher education held in June 1970. "The deliberations were organized around seven major, barrier-oriented papers--

five of which were responded to, in shorter papers, by scholars who held somewhat different views . . . . If one were to attempt to summarize the sense of the lively and sometimes heated discussion that followed the presentation of these papers, the key words would be 'change' and 'more.' Change the use being made of tests of scholastic aptitude and achievement from screening to educational; change the nature of the educational experience the college provides from one intended for an elitist student population to one responsive to the needs of a much more representative group of American youth; change the attitude of faculties toward minority/poverty youth from one of tolerance or even hostility to one of humanness; change the rigid, four-year requirement for graduation to a more flexible pattern in which students proceed at their own pace; change the policy of selective admissions to open admissions. The emphasis on 'more' was equally insistent: more truly free-access institutions strategically located; more effective compensatory and supportive programs; more relevant research on the teaching-learning process; more reliable data on the performance of 'high risk' students; more, much more, financial aid for the economically disadvantaged student, if he is to have equal access to higher education."[12]

COMPOSITION OF THE FORUMS

As noted above, according to Ireland the regular associational forums of the organization, as well as the more specialized forums described in the preceding paragraphs, devoted time and attention to the problems of minority youth in achieving access to postsecondary education. Elsewhere in his inventory he observed that "since the early 1960's" the College Board "has been made increasingly aware of the fact that minority groups [were] inadequately represented" in the councils of the Board. Ireland was able to report in 1971 that as a result of a concerted effort in this regard "approximately 27 of the total 175 committee members" and 3 of 25 trustees were representatives of minorities.

Numbers alone do not of course represent the only measure of commitment to and concern for equality in education, and it is important to note here that the forums as well as the programs of the College Board are sponsored

12. Stephen J. Wright, op cit., p. vii.

by a membership that is unanimously on record in support of equal rights. At their annual business meeting in 1966 the members adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas: The College Entrance Examination Board was organized to serve educational organizations in the responsible administration of the transition of students from secondary schools to colleges and other institutions of higher learning; and

"Whereas: The exclusion of qualified students from educational institutions by reason of their race or color is inimical to the educational purposes of the Board;

"Now therefore be it resolved: by the members of the College Entrance Examination Board, in meeting assembled, that:

"The Board of Trustees shall not recommend for membership in the College Entrance Examination Board any institution which practices racial segregation."

BOARD STAFF AS A FORUM

The Conceptual Framework adopted by the trustees in 1970 translated into policy a practice that the officers had initiated some years earlier. That policy and a similar one put into effect at Educational Testing Service called in essence for the inclusion on staff of "appropriate numbers of minority staff members, at levels diverse enough and high enough in rank to influence" both the making of policy and the operations of both agencies.

In his inventory Ireland reported, "In an effort to redress this situation (the fact that minority groups were inadequately represented on the staff), the officers directed the staff to compile a talent registry of individuals from minority groups who might be considered for staff positions as openings occur or new opportunities are created. This effort has resulted in substantial increases in minority representation. As of April 1971, out of a total College Board staff of 216 people, representatives of minorities numbered 36 of the 100 members of the supporting staff (33%) and 20 of the 116 persons (17%) at professional levels." As of July 1974, the comparable figures for a staff of 200 are 40 out of 92 members of the supporting staff (43%) and 19 of 108 persons at the professional level (18%).

A similar policy in force at Educational Testing Service designed to bring about greater representation of minority staff in all areas has been

equally successful, with a growth rate for minority staff in the last 10 years substantially in excess of the growth rate for total staff. Of particular relevance for the College Board are figures for those ETS staff members specifically assigned to College Board programs. In late 1975 minority staff comprised 14 percent of a total complement of 143 in ETS's College Board division including minority staff members with professional roles in division administration, program direction, test development, statistical analysis, and systems.

FOR THE FUTURE

The forums of the College Board, both those that are on-going and those devoted to the problems of minority youth, have served a useful purpose in helping identify barriers to higher education and in suggesting ways of dealing with them. It is important to recognize that many such barriers remain and to insure that opportunity for further discussion of them is provided. Strong and continuing representation of minorities in the formal councils of the College Board and conscientious adherence to the guidelines of the Conceptual Framework in the matter of minority representation on the staff should serve to insure that those barriers will not be overlooked in the deliberations of the association.

The specialized, ad hoc forums that have from time to time been created have also proved useful and, although it is not recommended that standing committees or councils be established to focus on minority concerns, it would seem wise from time to time to bring representatives of the nation's minority groups together separately and in combination in order to throw the remaining barriers to postsecondary study into sharp relief. It is therefore recommended for the immediate future that the 75th anniversary program of celebration provide opportunities for focusing on the barriers that still exist.

Demonstration Guidance Projects

For nearly 20 years the College Board has participated in or sponsored directly a variety of types of demonstration guidance projects involving minority youth.

EXAMPLES OF DEMONSTRATION GUIDANCE PROJECTS

Demonstration Guidance Project. The first demonstration guidance project carried the title "Demonstration Guidance Project." Bernard Ireland summarized the project this way: "From 1956-1962 the College Board provided financial support and extensive advisory services, chiefly through S. A. Kendrick, to the Demonstration Guidance Project. The Project was launched and carried out, with students at Junior High School 43 and George Washington High School, by the cooperative efforts of the New York City Board of Education, the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, and the College Board and was eminently successful in demonstrating that levels of performance and aspiration of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds can be dramatically improved by the provision of special teaching, special guidance and the provision of cultural opportunities not ordinarily available to those involved. This project formed the basis of what eventually became the Higher Horizons Programs in the New York City Schools."[13]

13. Bernard P. Ireland, "A Ten-year (1961-1971) Inventory of College Board Activities Aimed at Serving Minority/Poverty Youth and Their Access to Higher Educational Opportunity." Unpublished paper, 1971.

Project Opportunity. Project Opportunity was begun in 1964 with support from the Danforth and Ford Foundations. It was designed to increase the number of black students from participating schools who pursue postsecondary education. The participating schools were selected on the basis of criteria that characterize disadvantaged schools, the critical ones being a high dropout rate and an abnormally small proportion of students going on to education beyond the secondary level. Working in cooperation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and with representatives of participating colleges (most members of the College Board), the College Board was able, through the medium of Project Opportunity, to achieve the results outlined by Hugh R. Fordyce in a letter transmitting his final report on September 1974:

"It has been most encouraging to me to learn that some of the first students who were identified through Project Opportunity have now graduated from college and are occupying positions of importance in the world of work. Leonard Satterwhite was identified at the Durham Center and is now an assistant director of admissions at Vanderbilt University. Yvonne Anderson recently graduated from the University of Georgia and is now on the faculty at Northside High School in Atlanta. And a young man from Nashville called me last June as he was graduating from Morehouse and planning to begin work with the juvenile court. All these young persons came from homes where there was no pattern of college going and where there was insufficient money for college.

"I think it might be worthwhile for me to set down some of the things we have learned from Project Opportunity over the years. Perhaps some of these points may have been made by other programs, but nevertheless they are important.

"1. Talented young people come from many different backgrounds. In Project Opportunity some of the most outstanding students came from some of the poorest backgrounds.

"2. Financial stipends are not necessary for motivating young people to plan and prepare for college. Project Opportunity achieved a fine success rate without giving financial stipends to the participants.

"3. Good guidance services are essential in helping young persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to take full advantage of the opportunities available to them.

"4. There is an appropriate post-secondary educational setting for every high school graduate. Also, Project Opportunity counselors were able to help students find a college setting, if desired, even though the student may have had SAT scores in the low 200's and ranked in the bottom half of his class. The notion that students have to possess superior academic talents in order to go to college is simply not true.

"5. When students face a choice between two or more colleges they will choose the college which has shown more interest in and concern for them. Typically, this impression of concern (or its lack) is fostered by the way in which the admissions office and the financial aid office respond to applicants. Promptness is perhaps the key ingredient.

"6. Visits to college campuses are an effective way of motivating students for college. Perhaps the most important outcome of college visits is the realization among many students that they, too, can find satisfaction on a college campus and that there are other students like themselves at college.

"7. Colleges and school systems can work together in conducting a program of college planning and motivation. It was valuable for the high school counselor to have a person at the sponsoring college who could provide up-to-date information about such matters as admissions testing and financial aid practices.

"8. Limited programs, such as Project Opportunity, should have limited objectives. Project Opportunity began with the idea of changing the entire school program of studies in the schools in which it was operating. The program did not have the staff nor the expertise to carry out such an undertaking. In its latter years the program became simply a guidance project that tried to motivate young people for college. With its more limited objective it was successful.

"9. High school counselors need an outside administrator with clout to protect them from their own school principals. Unfortunately, most high school principals do not have an adequate understanding of good guidance techniques and most counselors do not have enough strength to fight for the right to do those activities which are worthwhile and avoid those which are non-productive. The 'outside' administration of Project Opportunity enabled Project Opportunity counselors to work effectively.

"10. All 'objective' measures of the effectiveness of guidance programs

are, to some extent, inadequate. Efforts to determine effectiveness should continue but caution should be taken in assuming that a higher rate of college-going, for example, means that a guidance program is improving.

"11. The practice of relying on teachers to nominate outstanding students for talent encouragement programs is likely to produce a list with far more females than males. If it is assumed that males should be encouraged by special programs in the same numbers as females, then greater reliance should be placed on other selection techniques, including standardized tests. Throwing out the tests has meant throwing out the males."

Although Fordyce's observations are of course particular to Project Opportunity, many of them are generalizable and, in this sense, characteristic of the findings of the many other demonstration projects in which the Board has become engaged since the days of Project 43.

Education Assistance Center. Bernard Ireland's brief description of the Education Assistance Center indicates the nature of this project: "In cooperation with New York University, the University Settlement, and the Urban League, the staff of the Guidance Services Program has participated since 1967 in a pilot project devoted to counseling minority/poverty students, parents, and others on educational and vocational plans. The project, called the Education Assistance Center, has received substantial financial support from the College Board, support which is being continued during 1971-72 while members of the Board staff are assisting members of the community in a reorganization of the Center. It is expected that after 1971-72 the community will assume full responsibility for carrying on the project."[14]

Project OPEN. This project, begun in 1967-68, was established at the initiative of and under the auspices of the College Board's office in Washington, D.C. Today it is the only one of the demonstration projects still operating at the secondary level under College Board auspices. A prospectus for the effort dated September 1967 indicated "that OPEN has a three-fold task before it. OPEN must assist in the IDENTIFICATION of disadvantaged students who are capable of successfully undertaking postsecondary school training. Secondly, an enormous part of our task will be MOTIVATION to encourage disadvantaged youth to believe that postsecondary

14. Ibid.

training is available and a possibility for him. Lastly, the heart of our program will be COUNSELING to assist youth to come to a decision concerning these educational goals and to help them to attain them."

Project OPEN was funded primarily by the United States Office of Education and conducted by the College Board in cooperation with a number of area's colleges and universities and the District of Columbia school system. In addition to carrying out the three tasks set forth above, it made information about the students who took advantage of the program available to the area's institutions of higher learning as well as to admissions offices from various other parts of the country.

Project Access. Project Access was initiated in 1968 at the invitation of and with support from the Ford Foundation. As noted in a summary status report submitted to the Foundation in December 1971, "From its beginning, the goals of Project Access have been to make available post-secondary opportunities for those students from minority and low income groups who desire further education and, where possible, assist them in gaining admission to appropriate post-secondary institutions." Different means of achieving these goals were employed in each of the four years of the project but "it should be noted, however, the guidance, research, and test development, combined with action programs designed to support the identification and guidance of the Access students have been common components."

In its first year, according to Ireland, the Board ". . . was able to test approximately 70,000 secondary school students with the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) and a biographical inventory designed to provide information about these students' backgrounds, family financial circumstances, and motivations for higher education. It seems clear that the large majority of these young people would not have taken the PSAT if it had not been for Project Access. Students participating in the original program attended schools in the cities of Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C. Working through its regional offices, the College Board conducted special workshops in the participating cities to aid school and college personnel in the interpretation of the test scores and biographical information. . . .

"The test information about the participating students is sent to colleges, universities and scholarship sponsors for use in identifying students for whom they might be able to provide admission and financial

aid opportunities. Hundreds of colleges, universities and talent search agencies are using the student descriptive data generated by the project."

Project Access continued to operate during 1970-71 and 1971-72 in Los Angeles, Memphis, and Washington, D.C. Each of these cities was "provided with Project Access funds to employ a full-time project director, to augment existing counselor personnel with counselor aides, and to conduct workshops and training programs for counselors, students, and parents."[15]

Other Projects. The projects just discussed represent the major ones in which the College Board has played a leading role. However, in a variety of contexts and a variety of ways the College Board has over nearly two decades, in association with other organizations, played a somewhat lesser role in a good many other related enterprises. Such cooperative enterprise has, for instance, been shared with HARYOU-ACT and Harlem Prep, with Aspira and T.R.I.B.E. (the Association of Aroostock Indians).

OUTCOMES

In addition to the types of results reported above by Fordyce, the College Board hoped for more. The nature of these hopes was expressed most explicitly in the case of Project Access. In a status report dated March 17, 1971 Albert G. Sims, then Vice President for Programs, wrote, "The prime objective of the project is to develop new measures and modes of service that will enable us better to provide for the minority/poverty population as a part of the regular Board program services." And later in the same report, "We have hopes that the research now underway . . . will give us the insights, the experience and perhaps the new instruments that the Board requires to offer better services to this part of its clientele."

In the meantime, few changes have been made in the College Board's basic service programs and no new instruments per se developed as a result of the College Board's participation in these projects. Nevertheless, the insights and experience gained in the course of their conduct have materially affected the world of the College Board. A consciousness of the problems of minority youth has been developed which keeps their interests in the forefront of staff thinking as it ponders new directions. Awareness that even the relatively small financial barrier that the test fee created could

15. Ibid.

deter a student from considering college led to the development of the fee-waiver program. Realization that the Board's responsibility for the welfare of the youth it helped get into college did not end with their registration as freshmen led to the development of the Minority Consulting Service. This service is discussed in more detail later on in this report.

There have also been effects outside the College Board. As noted above, for example, Project 43 led ultimately to the Higher Horizons Program in New York City. Project Access set the stage in Los Angeles for a Model Demonstration College Advisement Center under the auspices of the Los Angeles City Unified School District. And the Educational Assistance Center moved from College Board to community sponsorship.

Finally it should be noted that the College Board's presence and interest in this area did not go unnoticed. Over the years other agencies and institutions sought support from the College Board--technical, moral, and financial. Ireland's inventory contains many references to them. A partial listing would include the New York and Los Angeles City School Systems, New York University, the Urban League, the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, Fisk University, the American Institute for Research, Columbia University, the Merrill-Palmer School, Teachers College of Columbia University, the U.S. Office of Education, the Texas Association of Developing Colleges, the United Negro College Fund, the National Coordinating Council for Education Opportunity, Aspira, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the University Conference on Puerto Rican Studies, the State University System of Florida, the Higher Education Council on Urban Affairs, San Diego State College, the COPE Foundation, HARYOU-ACT, and T.R.I.B.E.

Nearly half of the institutions and organizations in this listing, are included in a section of Ireland's inventory headed "Grants made from College Board funds during fiscal years 1969-70 and 1970-71." Indeed, so expectant had segments of the educational community become of the Board's willingness to lend a financial hand that over a quarter of the Conceptual Framework is devoted to ground rules for the consideration of such support. Financial reverses in subsequent years have rendered these provisions virtually meaningless, and the current economic conditions suggest little opportunity for the College Board to make massive dollar contributions from its own treasury to demonstration projects either on its own or

under other auspices. Nevertheless, the College Board has itself demonstrated a concern for the minority/poverty youth of the nation and has produced a record of participation in the search for solutions to their problems in achieving access to higher education.

It would be presumptuous of this writer to suggest that the College Board has played a major or a leading role in opening up such access. As Stephen J. Wright, a Vice President of the College Board, has pointed out in a recent memorandum, "Unless a single, simple objective or problem is the target, it is practically impossible to make a really accurate or meaningful estimate of the Board's impact. There are two rather obvious reasons for this:

"1. The impact may be quite long-range as is so frequently the case when social or educational change is undertaken;

"2. The Board's programs and activities . . . constitute only one of several directed toward a complex, stubborn problem and the combined efforts may be far short of the dimensions of the problem."

Despite such demurrers, however, he does note later in the same memorandum, "We do know that the total of the efforts and forces has made a dramatic difference in minority enrollment [in higher education]. The black enrollment, for example, has tripled during the ten years since 1964."

FOR THE FUTURE

If economic circumstances render substantial financial support from the College Board for demonstration guidance projects unlikely, the educational lessons learned from the projects already discussed suggest that new approaches are called for in any event.

It has been conclusively demonstrated that sufficient infusions of time, money, and concern can overcome barriers to higher education. Under the right conditions the quality of education and counseling can be improved, talent can be identified, and the proportion of minority youth in a given school or school system pursuing education beyond the high school can be dramatically increased. The College Board knows how to do those jobs; it doesn't have to keep proving that to itself. Much as it would like to replicate those earlier projects on behalf of the students who would be affected, the Board neither has the resources to do so nor is it a social

service agency. The major remaining barrier to equal access to post-secondary education is money, and someone else is going to have to supply that.

Other major barriers are those cultural and educational disadvantages that many minority youth bring with them to secondary education and that cannot be overcome in the later years of high school. Two recommendations are made in this regard: first, that the interests of minority youth be kept explicitly in the forefront of College Board planning generally with special emphasis on early career counseling and decision-making; second, that it develop and seek outside support for one or two inner-city demonstration projects that would update the experience of the original Project 43 with respect to grades 7 through 10 in the light of the latter-day emergence of the career education concept, perhaps through a special adaptation of the College Board's Decision-Making Program. Earlier recognition by minority youth of the value of postsecondary study would remove many of the barriers with which the Board's demonstration guidance projects to date have had to deal.

Financial Aid Services

Lack of money is a barrier to postsecondary study not only in terms of its effect on the educational and counseling process, as already noted, but also more visibly and more directly in terms of availability of student financial support. As already reported, Doermann wrote, "Even though the amount of money available to college students has increased dramatically in the last ten years, and even though an increasing percentage of our high school graduates--from all races and all income levels--now goes on to college, it still remains true that lack of sufficient financial support remains one of the major barriers to higher education in the United States."[16] And, on the same occasion, Stephen J. Wright noted, "Perhaps the greatest barrier for minority/poverty youth is the barrier of money."[17]

Four years and the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) Program later, the barrier remains; a bit lower perhaps, but still there. It is lower, too, than it might otherwise have been without the College Scholarship Service (CSS) of the College Entrance Examination Board. The CSS was established in 1954 to assist colleges in making their limited financial aid dollars (primarily scholarship money at that time) go further. In making it possible for colleges to make comparable aid offers to stu-

16. Doermann, op. cit., p. 130.
17. Doermann, op. cit., p. vi.

dents, this service had at the heart of its rationale the concept of aid awarded according to need rather than academic ability. Taken almost for granted twenty years later, this concept is now the cornerstone of the minority call for financial support in achieving access to postsecondary study.

Other changes have taken place in the College Scholarship Service in the last twenty years. Most significant are the increases in the number and proportion of people in the age group going on to higher education and of the dollars supplied by the federal government for student financial aid. Also important are the emergence of a federal policy with respect to the award of aid and the transformation of the college admissions process from one that was primarily selective (particularly within the College Board membership and College Scholarship Service clientele) to one that is essentially open.

The increase in college-going on the part of the majority of course set a moving and ever-higher target for the minority to reach in seeking equality of access to higher education. Because so much of the overall increase was financed by massive new amounts of federal student financial aid, majority and minority attention was focused alike on evolving federal policy. In the process the principles of student financial aid administration espoused by the College Scholarship Service were altered to reflect the changes that were taking place. In particular the philosophy or principle that aid should be awarded first to those who "merited" it most was changed to one that calls for aid to be awarded first to those who need it most.

In the meantime the operations as well as the philosophy of the College Scholarship Service were affected. As more and more minority students, particularly the poor among them, sought access to higher education, it became apparent that significant numbers of them were turned off, or more accurately their parents were turned off, by the necessity of having to complete a Parents' Confidential Statement (PCS) far more complex than was needed to reflect their meagre resources. The Financial Aid Questionnaire, a simplified form of the PCS and available without charge, was eventually introduced. Computed by hand by college authorities, it proved unsatisfactory because in its simplicity the questionnaire was unable to distinguish among the relative needs of the neediest, and a simplified, low-

cost, machine-processable form called the Financial Aid Statement came into being.

The interests of minority/poverty students were reflected in changes in the rationale for the computation of financial need from the data supplied on the Parents' Confidential Statement, the Financial Aid Statement, and the Student Financial Statement (the upperclass or renewal counterpart of the PCS). These changes resulted from the deliberations within one of the specialized forums of the College Board, the Cartter Panel, which was appointed to review the entire CSS rationale for the computation of financial need. It recommended in 1970 that revisions be made in the amounts of money that families below the moderate income level could be expected to contribute to pay college expenses. In implementing this recommendation, expectations from low-income families were significantly reduced, and the concept of the negative contribution (the need of the poor family to replace the earnings lost as a result of a student family member attending college and not working) was introduced.

Throughout this period the search for an acceptable fee-waiver program for the Parents' Confidential Statement--a counterpart to the fee-waiver program of the Admissions Testing Program--continued without success for a variety of reasons. In the final analysis, however, it seems clear that it is not the PCS fee that is proving to be the financial deterrent to college attendance on the part of the nation's minority youth; the experience of the demonstration guidance projects already discussed suggests that one way or another the relatively minor barrier of the PCS fee can be hurdled or bypassed with the help of concerned advocates. Nor is it the rationale underlying the CSS computation of financial need that is keeping minority/poverty students out of higher education. It is instead the lack of adequate financial aid dollars.

The real challenge to the College Board and most particularly to the colleges and universities that represent its traditional clientele is not just to maintain commitment to the principle of awarding aid first to those who need it most in the face of rising costs and dwindling institutional financial aid dollars. Only the continued and greater infusion of public aid dollars at both the state and federal levels will have a real effect on the numbers of minority/poverty students attending postsecondary institutions, and it is to this end that the College Board and the CSS must turn their efforts in the years ahead.

Testing and Related Services

As already noted, the programs and services of the College Entrance Examination Board have traditionally been developed in response to problems identified within its several forums. Leaving discussion of the tests and of research related to them for the last and longest consideration, the following is a list of the contexts in which the College Board has responded to the problems of access to postsecondary study encountered by the nation's minority youth: fee waivers, Student Search Service, Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test, training activities, Minority Consulting Service, films and publications, minority scholarship programs, Puerto Rican activities, bilingual education, and minority-related research.

FEE WAIVERS

One of the lessons learned, or perhaps more correctly one of the assumptions confirmed, in the several demonstration talent search and guidance projects with which the College Board became associated was that test fees themselves constitute a barrier to higher education for the very poor. Given the opportunity to take guidance and admissions tests without charge, minority youth could be persuaded to participate. In the process, lost talent (talent, that is, as measured by conventional tests) could be found, degrees of educational disadvantage and of need for remediation could be measured, and students who might otherwise have dropped out could be brought into the mainstream of those seeking postsecondary education.

As a result of this experience the College Board initiated a program of fee waivers for the Admissions Testing Program in 1969-70, when the trustees appropriated $150,000. The history of the program shows the following results:

Year	Appropriation	Foregone Income
1965-66		$ 1,800
1966-67		21,500
1967-68		20,300
1968-69		25,400
1969-70	$ 150,000	40,500
1970-71	265,000	155,400
1971-72	290,000	227,700
1972-73	340,000	262,300
1973-74	286,000	283,700
Total	$1,331,000	$1,038,600

Although this record of contribution is impressive in its own right, it is only a partial measure of the College Board's commitment. To these totals must be added the costs of administering the program, which are estimated to have been $820,000 over its nine-year history. Although not of the same dollar magnitude, fee-waiver arrangements have also been made in connection with the Advanced Placement Program, the Comparative Guidance and Placement Program, and the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test.

For the future the fee-waiver programs should be maintained and expanded wherever possible.

STUDENT SEARCH SERVICE

The Student Search Service (SSS) is designed to help colleges identify and communicate with potential applicants with particular characteristics or special interests (such as field of study, place of residence, and test scores) who may not be aware of the courses available at a particular institution. The information is gathered, with permission from the students involved, from the Student Descriptive Questionnarie (SDQ), the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), and the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT). After receiving a col-

lege's specifications, the College Board supplies lists of names and addresses of students who have the characteristics designated.

The SSS suggests to institutions that make use of its services "that it can help find students who come from minority or poverty backgrounds and need special assistance. To students, this is a free service offered through the SDQ that allows students to place their names in a pool from which post-secondary educational institutions and scholarship sponsors secure names of potential students."

For the future it is recommended that use of the Student Search Service on behalf of minority youth be expanded. As one example, staff have suggested a means by which SSS could be used to benefit minorities with regard to the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, including provision to U.S. Office of Education of the names of BEOG low-income minority applicants--with the hope that a direct mailing to prospective applicants will enhance their participation. Another suggestion has been for a freestanding SDQ (apart from the test registration process) that would permit broader participation in the Student Search Service.

PSAT/NMSQT

The Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test proved to be a particularly effective instrument for identifying talent as measured by conventional college admissions tests. Made available without charge in the conduct of a number of demonstration projects, this regular pre-college counseling device has been used in a number of talent search and guidance projects as a mechanism both for uncovering otherwise hidden academic aptitudes and for exposing minority young people to the majority's testing instruments. It is currently being used in three large-scale efforts (apart from the talent search uses of the PSAT/NMSQT through its connection with the Student Search Service noted above). Black students participating in the regular fall administrations of the PSAT/NMSQT may enter the competition for National Achievement Scholarships administered by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. Similarly, black and other minority students may identify themselves to NSSFNS in order to participate in the college advisory and referral service and supplemental scholarship program offered by that organization. In addition, the College Board supports free sum-

mer administrations of the PSAT for Upward Bound projects and other agencies concerned with providing broader opportunities to disadvantaged youth. In 1974 more than 7000 students took the PSAT without cost through this program.

Used originally in this way with Project Access, the PSAT/NMSQT has the disadvantage of not turning up talents not measured by its verbal and mathematics score components. But particularly in large inner-city schools, where counselors' pupil loads are often ridiculously large, the PSAT/NMSQT does serve to stimulate an interest in attending college on the part of a good many minority students who might otherwise not have thought about going on.

For the future, although the utility of the PSAT/NMSQT as a talent identification device is limited, it should continue to support the Student Search Service and guidance and scholarship programs for minority students and that it continue to be made available on a no-charge basis in appropriate circumstances.

TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Another of the important lessons learned from the demonstration projects was the need for training people responsible for the college admissions process as it affects minority youth. Because college-going was such a rarity in high schools enrolling large numbers of minority students, counselors at these schools were usually not versed in the intricacies of the process. Also, college admissions and financial aid officers found it difficult to deal with the unfamiliar problems that minority youth posed for them. As a consequence, many of the demonstration projects from the outset included training components for the counselors and students involved.

Although the necessity of providing special training for secondary school counselors participating in these activities may be apparent, a word about the reference to the training of student participants in the talent search process may be in order. Before talent can be properly guided, it must be identified and its attention must be attracted. Although counselors are able through conversations with teachers, their own observations, and student test performance to identify talent, their audiences are limited to their own schools, and there is no assurance that

the students thus identified will pay attention to the counselors' advances on behalf of postsecondary study. One of the lessons learned through the various demonstration projects both within and without the world of the College Board was that minority students who have gone to college are the best salesmen for higher education. They can be helpful to counselors in dealing with identified talent, but are not limited to certain school bodies, and their efforts are focused and enhanced when they have had formal training such as that provided by Afro-Americans for Equal Opportunity, a Harvard-based talent-search and guidance activity manned by minority students themselves. With the assistance of the College Board, Afro-Americans for Equal Opportunity prepared and distributed widely an excellent information bulletin designed especially for inner-city black students.

At the same time within higher education, the College Board has also supported or cooperated in the support of training activities for the college administrators from the minority communities. As noted earlier, according to Ireland, "the College Board, under the terms of a grant from the Texas Association of Developing Colleges, has been involved in the training of financial aid officers."[18] And from the same source, "At the request of the Sloan Foundation, and with the cooperation of the United Negro College Fund institutions, the Board participated in efforts to improve the admissions and financial aid practices in the UNCF colleges." More recently, in reporting by memorandum about two training institutes, one in southern California and the other in Texas, Stephen J. Wright indicated, "The two institutes conducted for Mexican-Americans had as their initial purpose increasing the number of competent financial aid officers among Mexican-Americans. Having visited both institutes and having examined the programs of both, I have no doubt that the initial purpose was accomplished, but whether the larger or ultimate purpose of the institutes --increasing the enrollment of Mexican-Americans in colleges--has been accomplished, it is much too early to tell."

For the future the experience of the past suggests that, despite Wright's demurrer, training programs are useful and do work. They should be continued as in the past on a pragmatic basis whenever a specific need,

18. Ireland, op. cit., p. 12.

either at the postsecondary or the secondary education level, has been identified. At the same time, to insure more basic and permanent results, steps should be taken to insure that all regular counselor training programs, educational guidance course sequences, and other formal educational or training programs for admissions and financial aid officers include segments dealing with the special problems of minority youth in seeking access to postsecondary study. And finally, steps should be taken to utilize the ability of minority students who have attended college to influence other minority students still in high school.

MINORITY CONSULTING SERVICE

This service, conceived, designed, and put into operation by Lawrence Barclay, Minority Affairs Officer of the College Board, represents a special kind of training activity--one designed for a postsecondary institution rather than for high school counselors. The emerging need for such an activity speaks positively to the success achieved in attracting minority youth to higher education but negatively to the ability of some institutions to handle such students once they have been admitted and enrolled. Recognition of the College Board's responsibility in this regard is explicit in the reference in the Conceptual Framework to the "retention" of minority youth once admitted to higher education.

Through the Minority Consulting Service, the services of a panel of experienced consultants is made available to institutions seeking to improve their on-campus handling of minority applicants and enrollees. The consultants themselves are individuals who have had successful experiences to share with the institutions seeking help.

For the future, although the big enrollment push on behalf of minority students appears to be waning, this service should be continued as an encouragement to institutions of higher education.

FILMS AND PUBLICATIONS

Through the mediums of films and publications, particularly publications, the College Board has sought to support its activities and interests on behalf of minority youth. Many of the titles published by the College Board speak to the nature of the problems involved: The Search For Talent, 1960, edited by John Monro; Interpreting the SAT Scores of Disadvantaged

Students, 1965; Compulsory Education for the Disadvantaged, 1966, by Edmund W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson; Mexican Americans in School, A History of Educational Neglect, 1970, by Thomas Carter; Financing Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, 1970; and Barriers to Higher Education, 1971. A Chance to Go to College, published in 1971, is a directory of 800 or so colleges that provide special help for students from minority and low-income families. Free-Access Higher Education, 1970, by Warren W. Willingham, reported on a study of the accessibility of inexpensive, non-selective higher education in each of the states. The College Board provided support for the reprinting and distribution of 200,000 copies of College and the Black Student published originally by Harvard Student Agencies, Inc. and has itself published and distributed some 673,000 copies of Going Right On, prepared by former officers of Afro-Americans for Equal Opportunity. "Something to Build On," a film produced by the College Board to interest junior high school minority youth in continuing their education, continues to be in great demand. Ireland reports 22 articles in the College Board Review between 1965 and 1971 dealing with the problems of minority youth, "more . . . than on any other topic on the school-college scene."[19]

For the future the College Board should continue to insure that its programs of films and publications deal with this important topic. It will be particularly important in the years ahead that the College Board's editors be sensitive to the problems of minority youth in seeking access to higher education so that these problems may continue to receive attention.

MINORITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

The Upper Division Scholarship Program and the Minority Engineering Scholarship Program represent a special kind of demonstration project, only indirectly related to the College Board's testing programs. Tests do play a part in the valuation of applicant credentials, and a hoped-for though unrealized spillover on the Comparative Guidance and Placement Program did influence the decision to accept sponsorship of the Upper Division Scholarship Program (UDSP). For these reasons the two minority scholarship

19. Ireland, op. cit., p. 8.

programs are included for discussion here rather than as demonstration projects per se.

The UDSP, designed to increase the number of minority youth transferring from two-year to four-year institutions, has successfully demonstrated that able talent can be identified and encouraged to continue if aid dollars are available. As with Minority Engineering Scholarship Program, a program designed to increase the number of minority students studying engineering, it has been shown that the goal can be achieved when money is available. Given the simple objective of increasing the number of baccalaureate degree holders among the four larger minority groups--blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians--our records indicate that 1,087 have been graduated to date and that 1,530 are still enrolled.

The awarding and administration of financial aid is not a normal activity of the College Board, and the Board did not take the initiative in the establishment of either of its two minority scholarship programs. Rather, it was sought out as a sponsor for a finite, short-range period in both instances.

For the future it is recommended that the College Board respond to such external initiatives and take advantage of the expertise it has developed in the field whenever appropriate. It is further explicitly recommended, however, that the College Board not attempt to establish such programs on its own.

PUERTO RICAN ACTIVITIES

The activities of the College Board in Puerto Rico are often overlooked in any survey of its programs and services on behalf of minority youth. There are several reasons for this oversight. For one reason, these activities are also properly identified with and considered a part of the College Board's international education program insofar as they involve the use of the Prueba de Aptitud Academica (PAA) in the rest of Latin America and the consultation provided by staff elsewhere in the hemisphere. For another, the island commonwealth is geographically separated from the mainland. A third reason is the language difference. These latter two reasons have led to separate-but-equal programs that are in a

sense contradictory to the College Board's usual stance of seeking integrated programs.

In fact the College Board's activities in Puerto Rico were formally initiated in the early 1960s in response to the special needs of an important minority within the nation's total citizenry. Indeed the potential experience to be gained through service there was originally perceived as contributing to the response of the College Board to minority needs on the continent. For instance, the success achieved in creating a Spanish SAT from scratch, so to speak, (the Prueba de Aptitud Academica is not a translation of the Scholastic Aptitude Test but an instrument developed according to the same psychometric techniques in Spanish) served as a model for the development of an experimental test instrument for use in poor black urban communities. This instrument, unfortunately, turned out to do no better than the regular SAT in ranking individuals according to ability and hence in predicting their success in college. The PAA has been used experimentally in North American settings, so far with only mixed acceptance.

For the future it is suggested that the College Board's experience in Puerto Rico can be put to much more effective use in Puerto Rican and Mexican American communities within the continental United States than has thus far been achieved. For example, recent conversations about possible College Board services to large urban school and college systems serving large numbers of Puerto Rican students have led to the suggestion that the English-language section of the PAA might possibly serve as an instrument like the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) in assessing English proficiency of bilingual, Spanish- and English-speaking youth who may plan to pursue studies in colleges where English is the language of instruction. More experimentation along these and similar lines is needed.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

As already noted, bilingual education has received some attention in connection with the Puerto Rican and urban ghetto activities of the College Board. Staff members have been involved with college entrance examination authorities in Canada, where French and English exist side by side,

and in the Philippines, where a student may bring as many as five tongues with him to higher education. As yet, there has not been a concerted effort within the College Board to conceptualize a comprehensive approach to the problems faced by students from bilingual backgrounds or circumstances. Such an effort should be mounted.

MINORITY-RELATED RESEARCH

Any attempt to summarize the minority-related research in which the College Board and ETS on behalf of the Board have engaged is bound to do inadequate justice to its coverage and its depth. College Board-supported research on minority-related issues goes back at least to the early 1950s, and a steady stream of papers and publications began to emerge in the early 1960s. The work since that time has spanned a wide range of interest and has included studies of possible bias in tests, in the testing situation, and in the use of test scores. The research efforts have not been limited, however, to testing matters. For example, problems in guidance and counseling of disadvantaged students and financing of higher education for minorities have received research attention.

No attempt will be made to present here a comprehensive summary of this research, although some findings of test-related research are alluded to in the following section. In the abstract, given the efforts that the College Board has put into minority-related research, it is difficult to understand why their tests continue to be suspect. However, given the fact that minority youth are still not enrolled in higher education in equal proportion to the majority, it is not surprising that there continue to be calls not only for moratoriums but also for more research.

In the matter of in-house research, the comment of one young black woman at an early College Board conference on the subject has remained very much in mind. One of the speakers made a number of references to published findings to support his arguments. Some of those papers he had authored himself. Suddenly the young woman realized that the author of of the references was the speaker of the podium and exclaimed to the audience in general, "Do you mean to tell me that the author he kept referring to was himself?" While she may have been naive about the niceties of formal educational research, this young black woman was expressing the

attitude of the minority communities toward research conducted by the "establishment."

For the future, given the volume of research that has been conducted in-house, so to speak, on existing College Board test instruments, it is suggested that future research by the College Board or by ETS on behalf of the Board explore new aspects of the problem of achieving equality in higher education. To the maximum extent possible, the College Board and ETS should work with outside authorities on minority affairs, particularly those representing minority interest, in seeking to unravel the complicated questions pertaining to test bias. Meanwhile, new College Board and ETS research efforts should be mounted in support of the development of nontraditional measures of human aptitude and achievement. This recommendation is consistent with the College Board's Program Planning and Research Division's general call for support of activities in the field of career education and with its explicit call for research on new measures applicable to minority youth.

BIAS IN RELATION TO TESTS

In the world of the College Board, the most persistent and complex issue involving the interests of minorities has had to do with the matter of bias in relation to tests. "Test bias" can have many meanings, and much of the difficulty in discussing the subject comes from the fact that people are often speaking or writing to each other with different meanings in mind. For the purpose of this analysis seven kinds of "test bias" have been identified: bias not necessarily of the tests but associated with the tests, the settings in which they are used, and the ways in which they are used. They are what I have chosen to call predictive bias, social bias, use bias, criterion bias, content bias, reliability bias, and center bias.

Predictive Bias. When psychologists and psychometricians speak about test bias, they are usually referring to either content or item bias or to what is called predictive bias. A test can be said to be biased against a subgroup if it is less valid in predicting performance for that subgroup than for the total group. All the studies that have been made of the SAT in this regard suggest that it predicts equally as well for mi-

norities as for the majority; there is no evidence to date that disadvantaged students are penalized by the SAT, if by that one means that they get misleadingly low scores.

Six years ago it could be said that the conclusion (from more than 50 studies conducted on students of all ages) "is simply that the traditional academic ability tests as we know them can be used confidently with students of varied backgrounds and racial composition to predict their success in traditional academic programs . . . . It is simply not true, as far as we can tell, that the disadvantaged student is penalized by the SAT, if you mean that he makes a misleadingly low score."

Today it can be reported that in the meanwhile, using this definition, investigators found little evidence of bias in the SAT as a predictor of college grades. Indeed, what evidence has been found suggests a positive bias--that is, the SAT tended to predict that blacks would do better in college than they did, in fact, do. For the future it is suggested that the question of prediction bias appears to have had all the research attention it either needs or deserves as far as the College Board's traditional testing program is concerned.

Content Or Item Bias. Tests are said to have face validity if they appear on the surface to make sense. The face validity of the SAT as it relates to minorities is challenged by those who claim that bias is obvious from the facts generally that the test is written in "standard English," is a disadvantage to the student who speaks, say, "Negro nonstandard English," and specifically that some of the items are foreign to the culture of a given minority. This might be described as content bias, and the College Board and ETS are trying to do something about it. One problem inherent in eliminating content bias is that reviewers representing a given minority seldom agree on which test items are biased. Another problem is that some research suggests that the differences between "standard English" and "Negro nonstandard English" are not so great as to invalidate test performance.

It is my understanding that investigations of individual items have revealed, at times, interesting cultural phenomena. (Some Texans, I am told, often did not know what a scorpion was because the scorpion, although a prevalent nuisance in their part of the state, was more commonly known as a 'stinglizard.') Surprisingly, and despite much expressed

concern from the black community, findings of black-white differences of this type (content or item bias) were rare. Nevertheless, although such research may indicate that test items tend generally not to be biased against minorities in this sense, it has not led to the conclusion that problems relating to test content are nonexistent. On the contrary, such research has served to provide a focus on areas in which solutions are most likely to be found. More recent work in item analysis, for instance, suggests that, although black-white differences in individual item responses may be rare, differences among groups that have grossly different language experiences do sometimes occur.

For the future, therefore, it is recommended that research on item and content bias be pursued.

It should also be noted that the College Board has not sought to deal with the question of content bias through the review and research mechanisms alone. Steps have also been taken to provide minority input to the test development process. Thus, in constituting policy and development committees of school and college faculty members to guide the development of tests in various subject areas, the College Board has continued to make every effort to include minority representatives. Last year, for instance, it could be said that, of the discipline committees charged with reviewing all existing tests and making recommendations for the future, American History, Biology, English, German, Mathematics, and Physics all had at least one black member. The Spanish Committee had several native speakers of Spanish of whom one was Puerto Rican. All the test development committees for the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) General Examinations and for the CLEP Subject Examinations included black members, as did several of the Advanced Placement Committees. For the future it is important that this policy continue to be implemented.

Criterion Bias. Tests also get blamed for a kind of bias that might better be called criterion bias than test bias. The SAT is most frequently validated against freshman grades. Freshman grades, however, are gained primarily through the use of standard written English, not through the use of the language of the ghetto or barrio. Perhaps the black student will do better later, say, on senior grades and then, more important, perform a valued role in society as an adult. Here education or training (our natural criterion) is seen as the instrument rather than the

goal. Some blacks argue, for instance, that the number of black lawyers is a more important criterion for determining who should get into college and into law schools than the prediction of academic performance.

Criterion bias rests on the assumption that a higher education program is fixed, and students are sought who fit it. Some critics claim that the criterion should be changed to fit the students, whatever their level of competence. Their view has no place for prediction in terms of judging who will best fit the program (as in meritocratic selection) and does not even accept the concept of some minimum level of competence (as in the qualified-or-not model). To achieve truly open admissions, therefore, tests that measure something different than the SAT does are needed.

For the future, support needs to be given to the trends already observed toward the consideration of higher level criteria (for example, senior grades in college, rather than simply freshman grades, or measures of success in adult life) and toward consideration of multiple criteria in relation to multiple predictors.

Reliability Bias. Another basis for the claim that the SAT is biased is the often-made observation that a particular black student scored poorly on the test but performed well in college. Enough such cases are cited to lend initial credibility to the claim, but the layman ascribes a precision to the test score that the psychometrician does not. In fact the observed discrepancies between scores and performance exist in the same proportion for the majority as for the minority. No real bias exists here, and perhaps it ought not to be recognized with a name, but for purposes of discussion I have called it "reliability bias."

For the future it will be important in this regard to insure that appropriate steps are taken to inform minority communities in general and minority youth in particular about the degree of imprecision to be expected from standardized tests.

Social Bias. Whether or not they admit the lack of predictive bias on the part of the SAT, critics point out the black students as a subgroup perform less well on the average than the majority; they argue, therefore, that the test is biased against blacks. The fault here is with society, not the predictive validity of the test. This kind of bias, which might be called social bias, is a result of the unfortunate fact that most mi-

norities do not have the same educational experience as the majority. The tests, therefore, reflect this social bias.

For the future it is recommended that the College Board continue its efforts to help in the achievement of equality of access to postsecondary education for the nation's minority youth. The need to improve their educational circumstances is basic and is a specific goal in the College Board's search for better career-oriented assessment and guidance instruments.

Test Use Bias. Some charges of bias are rooted in the claim that the admissions system is biased and that tests are used to support that bias. In this sense, the "system" is perceived as employing the predictive validity of the tests to support a social bias. If an institution does not want to admit blacks, it can rest on the predictive validity of the tests to exclude them.

Test use bias and social bias are hard to differentiate. Either or both are specifically asserted in relation to any subgroup whose members are not admitted to college in proportion to the number of candidates who exceed some minimum performance level (the "qualified/not qualified" approach). Selective admissions is perceived as meritocratic in the sense that candidates are ranked according to their academic predictions and then chosen from the top down until enrollment is filled. Because of the social bias noted above, minority students will tend to fall near the bottom of the qualified list and not make the cut-off line. The issue in the well-known DeFunis case is between meritocratic ranking and proportionate representation under a qualified-or-not model.

For the future, research is needed to determine ways in which the application of value judgments in the use of tests can be adjusted to increase minority enrollments without engendering complaints of 'reverse discrimination' from majority groups.

Center Bias. As noted earlier, desegregation of College Board test centers was followed by charges that certain of them were hostile in the eyes of minority youth. As a result of a recommendation made at the 1970 College Board Annual Meeting in New York that in effect called the College Board and ETS to become more sensitive to problems minority students were encountering at test centers, the Committee on Hostile Test Center Envi-

ronment was established at ETS. The Committee, which began operating in 1971, conducted investigations in three principal areas: interviews in the field and observations of Admissions Testing Program (ATP) administrations; a review of College Board and ETS publications; and an examination of ATP test center management.

As a result of the committee's work, a number of changes were made affecting the location of test centers (more centers in minority communities), communication to test supervisors (concerning equal treatment of candidates), observation of test centers by ETS staff (to assess their climates with respect to minority students), recruitment of supervisors, and the conditions of test administrations themselves.

For the future, specific steps must continue to be taken to insure that test performance is not adversely affected by testing conditions. The ETS Guidelines for Testing Minorities contain a number of such specific steps.

ETS GUIDELINES FOR TESTING MINORITIES

Concern for all the problems recited above, and more, resulted in 1974 in the preparation at ETS of a statement of guidelines for the testing of minority students. It reads in part as follows:

"Misuse and misinterpretation of tests are long-standing problems, and with the increased participation of minority examinees in testing programs, the problems are exacerbated. Because racial discrimination is so much a part of the life experience of minority persons, agencies that develop tests and those who administer them are automatically suspect in the minority community. For example, reports of the use of arbitrary cut-off scores as the single criterion for job placement or admission confirm suspicions that tests are being used to discriminate against minorities.

"Contentions that low scores made by minority examinees on tests reflect a less-than-adequate public educational system do little to ease the pain of a refusal from a college or denial of job opportunity. And the evidence of validity studies (usually relying, however, on first-year grades as the criterion) seems to run counter to the examples of persons who "make it" or do well in college despite low scores on standard tests. And many of the people who are screened out by tests view them less as predicting devices and more as credentialling instruments, most often used

unfairly to exclude minority persons from educational and work opportunities.

"ETS' job is partly programmatic: our tests and norms must be appropriate to the more heterogeneous populations, tests must be properly administered, and tests and test information must be correctly used.

"Our job is also educational. Tests are often erroneously viewed as measuring such global constructs as "intelligence" or "mental ability," which are in turn thought to be unchanging, genetically-determined characteristics of people. Such perceptions of tests are not infrequently encouraged by the titles assigned tests by test makers and publishers. Practices and statements based on such notions have understandably created mistrust of tests, particularly on the part of minority-group members.

"The recommendations contained in this report are based on the more accurate conception of a test as a device for eliciting some type of performance that one wants to observe--spelling words, drawing inferences from paragraphs, or solving mathematical problems, for example. The raw test score describes the performance elicited by the test, usually in terms of number of items correctly answered. The interpretation of a test, then, should be made while keeping in mind the specific kind of operation carried out by the examinee in taking the test, such as identifying the misspelled word or finding in a list the synonym of a word. Success in such operations clearly depends in part upon opportunity to learn not only the mechanics of test taking but also the content covered; and the test, it should be clear, does not measure an immutable trait but a developed ability.

"In administering a test, it is obviously important to make sure that test performance is not unduly influenced by such conditions as distracting noises, poor lighting, inability to hear the instructions or negative attitudes of the test supervisor. On the other hand, it is not possible to eliminate certain prior conditions that may influence test performance, such as amount and quality of schooling, quality of instruction in reading, language spoken in the home, or presence or absence of other influential factors. The purpose of the test is to find out how well each examinee, at a particular point in time, can carry out such operations as spelling, reading, solving mathematical problems, or interpreting a passage. It is not appropriate to expect a test to compensate for inade-

quate opportunities to learn; but the educational opportunities and experiences of the candidate can be taken into account in interpreting the test score. Since a test can only supply information about current level of performance, taking action based on a test requires information other than test score alone. The score should be viewed as providing a description of a certain specific behavior at a particular time, as influenced by numerous factors, both positive and negative.

"In addition to the standard, professionally-sound testing practices that are applicable to all candidates, the additional guidelines for testing minority group examinees that follow are provided. These guidelines for the testing of minority-group members fall under the headings of Test Construction, Test Administration, and Test Interpretation.

"The recommendations in the first category have to do with minimizing factors in the test itself that may unfairly handicap members of minority groups. Such factors, for example, would result from including in the test stimulus materials that differentiate between groups but do not measure the attribute that the test is supposed to measure.

"The recommendations under Test Administration are concerned primarily with controlling conditions during the testing that might introduce unfairness in the determination of test performance.

"The recommendations under Test Interpretation are concerned with minimizing misinterpretation and misuse of test information by clients of ETS, including the examinees themselves and others who have access to test scores. ETS has a clear responsibility to its clients to make available to them information and guidance which will improve their use of tests, especially ETS tests.

"A final section of the report presents the committee's recommendations regarding a procedure for implementing the proposed guidelines.

"Many of these guidelines are consistent with current ETS practices, at least in most programs; but other guidelines may require substantial modification of ETS procedures. Although much has been accomplished, much remains to be done in improving fairness of testing procedures."

The specific guidelines that follow may be found in the source document. For the future the College Board should encourage ETS to continue its pursuit of that process of improvement.

Organizing for the Future

This report has suggested two foci around which the College Board's activities in the minority/poverty area might be both conceptually and administratively organized. One effort must of course focus on the continuing task of making the College Board's on-going programs and services relevant to the needs and interests of the nation's minority youth. The other effort must build upon the emergence of the career education concept as a new organizing principle for the College Board. Before treating the implications of these twin efforts for the future, however, reference should first be made to one earlier attempt to comprehend the Board's (and in this instance ETS) activities in the minority/poverty area within a single comprehensive framework and, second, to the Conceptual Framework for College Board activities in the minority/poverty area which annunciates current College Board policy in this regard.

THE HEAR PROPOSAL

Over the period from 1969 to 1971 the officers of the College Board and ETS had under consideration a proposal for comprehending their activities on behalf of minority youth within a national program designed to coordinate the efforts of local school systems, talent-search and guidance centers, and minority communities. Called the Higher Educational Ability Recognition Program (HEAR), it was perceived as a single synergistic, nationwide effort that would design and integrate the changes necessary in

guidance, counseling, testing, admissions, financial aid, teaching, and curriculum in order to achieve equality of access to higher education.

For a variety of reasons the HEAR Program never progressed beyond the stage of conceptualization. Without attempting to suggest all of them, some of the major reasons appear to have been the following. Its ambition outstripped practicality; HEAR was just too massive in scope to get off the ground. The time was not ripe; the push for minority enrollment had peaked and since plateaued. The economy, particularly as it affected higher education, had begun to deteriorate; the dollars for implementation simply were not available--either within education generally or at the College Board and ETS in particular. Finally, somehow, the sponsorship simply was not right. For one thing, there was doubt as to whether both the exciting talent-search and guidance efforts would be willing to be brought under a single umbrella. For another, in an effort to avoid the impropriety (in the eyes of the minority communities) of "establishment" sponsorship (by the College Board and ETS), governance by a semi-independent corporate entity (in effect, a minority-staffed joint enterprise) was proposed. However, this would have made the program a separate-but-equal effort rather than an integrated one; indeed, under one interpretation of the proposal, a separate-but-equal effort would have been required for each of the major minorities.

Although HEAR was never launched, a number of related developments occurred. Opportunities for minority staff members to meet and even "to retreat" were afforded; at one time, for instance, there was a joint Staff Committee on Minority Affairs. "ETS Guidelines for Testing Minorities" were implemented and remain under review by an internal staff Review Committee and an external Advisory Committee on the Testing of Minorities. Efforts were undertaken to increase further the representation of minorities on the staffs of both the College Board and ETS. Most important, perhaps, the Conceptual Framework for the College Entrance Examination Board's Program in the Minority/Poverty Area was developed.

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Since September 26, 1970, the College Board has been conducting activities designed to remove barriers to higher education for the nation's minority

youth in accordance with the following statement, known as the Conceptual Framework:

"The mission of the College Entrance Examination Board, as stated in its Charter, is to serve educational organizations in connection with the transition of students from secondary schools to colleges and other institutions of higher learning and in the coordination of secondary school and higher educational activities relating to the identification and evaluation of student capacities, the admission of students and their educational guidance.

"The mission was made more explicit by a special committee on 'The Organization and Functions of the College Entrance Examination Board.' The Committee stated, in part, that the mission of the Board should be interpreted to mean that the Board is concerned with the broad process of admissions, which begins to affect students through formal programs of college preparation and guidance in the schools as early as grade seven. The Committee suggested further that the Board's 'thinking and action should place major emphasis on problems of access to higher education. It cannot be content merely with the management of existing activities.' The list of restrictions on access, the Committee asserted, is a familiar one and that while the Board's activities are aimed at removing these restrictions, the problems involved 'require continuing redefinition and a persistent search for solutions.'

"For young, white, middle-class Americans, the Board has been almost phenomenally successful in carrying out its mission. The minority/poverty population, on the other hand, has been relatively unaffected, despite the special efforts made by the Board over the past several years. These efforts include, among others, Project Opportunity, the Educational Assistance Center on the East Side, Project Access, efforts to integrate its staff, fee waivers, and several colloquia concerned with the problem. Nevertheless, the Board's continuing concern for a more effective program for minority/poverty students is based on the fact that they are grossly under-represented among students entering 'colleges and other institutions of higher learning,' and that much more must be done if the situation is to be redressed. In other words, the Board has made a policy decision to do its full share in assisting minority/poverty students to become appro-

priately represented in the colleges and other institutions of higher learning and to increase, significantly, their chances of completing the programs they enter. This decision is consistent with and relevant to its mission, as stated in its Charter, and the interpretation of this mission developed by the special Committee on organization and functions. However, as the Board moves to do its full share, it recognizes the fact that some of the barriers lie, at least in part, outside of its mission, influence and control.

"In developing its program the Board makes the assumption that minority/poverty students face identifiable barriers to higher education that differ in degree and in kind from those faced by white, middle-class Americans, that these barriers must be removed if minority/poverty students are to have equal opportunity for higher education, and that the Board's program for minority/poverty students should be directed at those barriers. These barriers include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

"(1) Ineffective and inadequate guidance services in the elementary and and secondary schools;

"(2) Serious academic underdevelopment, resulting in part from or reflecting inadequate programs and ineffective teaching in the public schools;

"(3) The paucity of reliable instruments and devices that help to assess or describe their educational potentials in terms that reflect the quality and nature of their intellectual functioning in a manner useful for planning their further development;

"(4) The unwillingness of many institutions of higher learning to accept students who do not meet traditional admission requirements, or to consider the alteration of their traditional conceptions of the content and processes of higher education;

"(5) The absence or inadequacy of programs in most colleges to support minority/poverty students in existing programs;

"(6) The absence of collegiate participation and achievement as prominent social norms in the families and communities from which minority/poverty youth come, thus depriving them of models and sources of motivation through which they may become aware of the relationship between achievement in the public schools and careers requiring higher education;

"(7) The non-supportive environments in which many of the students live;

"(8) Low family incomes;

"(9) The absence of commitment on the part of government, at the various levels, and the majority of the institutions to remove the barriers.

"Singly and/or in combinations, these are formidable and complex barriers, and their removal involves both long-range and short-range programs. The long-range efforts must be concerned with the quality of the teaching and counseling received in the public schools, the nature of the curriculum at both the public school and higher education levels, the raising of family incomes or more innovative ways and means of providing financial aid, and effective ways of neutralizing or compensating for the non-supportive environments. The short-range efforts must be concerned with those students already enrolled in the high schools and as freshmen and sophomores in the colleges, lest still another generation of these students be lost. In both long-range and short-range efforts, there are obvious needs for more information, action programs, demonstrations, research, and forums that consider, critically, next steps. What the Board does in this minority/poverty area will be a function of its mission and of its resources--its prestige and influence, its membership, its staff and its funds.

"For its more traditional clientele, the Board has proceeded to accomplish its mission in the following ways, and it would be reasonable to assume that it should turn to these as the best approach to augmenting its efforts in the minority/poverty area:

"(1) Developed instruments which have enabled admissions officers and committees to assess the potential of students to pursue, successfully, the work in their respective institutions;

"(2) Developed instruments which assess the achievement of students who have pursued advanced or special study in the secondary schools;

"(3) Improved the counseling and guidance in the secondary schools and provided, for the students, comprehensive information concerning the colleges;

"(4) Developed instruments and procedures for assessing and administering financial aid;

"(5) Developed and sponsored research relevant to the admissions and

counseling processes;

"(6) Conducted forums for the critical examination of new and unsolved problems in admissions, counseling, financial aid and placement;

"(7) Disseminated, widely, to high schools and colleges information relating to the research and the admissions, counseling, financial aid and placement processes.

"In other words, the Board must make every effort to see that its regular programs are effectively brought to bear on the barriers. But this will not be enough. It must, therefore, supplement its regular programs by a variety of other efforts:

"(1) Conducting or sponsoring significant research or pilot projects and demonstrations which may result in new measuring instruments, new practices and procedures and significant changes in curricula;

"(2) Greatly expanding its clearinghouse functions through publications and other devices for significant information relating to the removal of the barriers;

"(3) Conducting or sponsoring workshops, institutes and colloquia designed to help institutions and their officers deal more effectively with the barriers and suggest next steps toward the elimination of such barriers;

"(4) To waive its own fees whenever they constitute a barrier and to include on its staff, as a matter of policy, appropriate numbers of minority staff members, at staff levels diverse enough and high enough in rank to influence both development and the implementation of policy having for its purpose the removal of the barriers."

There follow four paragraphs concerning ground rules (now rendered obsolete by current economic conditions) governing College Board financial support of projects sponsored by other agencies. The Conceptual Framework then concludes:

"In selecting projects and activities that constitute its minority/poverty program of priorities at any given point in time, the Board will attempt to take into account those barriers which are excluding the largest number of students, the progress that has been made in the elimination of the several barriers by its own efforts and the efforts of others, the special expertise of the Board and its mission, and the judgments of those best qualified to evaluate a given effort."

A FUTURE FOCUS FOR THE COLLEGE BOARD

In charting its future course the College Board is currently organizing its efforts conceptually according to four priority areas for development and administratively through the medium of its Program Planning and Research Division (PPRD). The four priority areas for development are:

"1. Services designed for the traditional transfer from secondary school to college (the Admissions Testing Program and the College Scholarship Service).

"2. An expanded and flexible set of aptitude and achievement tests (the present Admissions Testing Program, Comparative Guidance and Placement Program, Advanced Placement Program, and College-Level Examination Program, as well as the APP/CLEP alignment).

"3. Guidance services for all students in secondary schools.

"4. Guidance services appropriate to the growing number of adult students engaging in recurrent education."[20]

Although the interests of the nation's minorities are implicit in all four of these areas, two of the goals set by PPRD are particularly pertinent. In calling for the "Maintenance and Strengthening of Programs for the Transition from Secondary School to College" it explicitly notes, "In all these efforts, continued attention must . . . be devoted to the impact of programs on minority students."[21] The PPRD also calls for the development of guidance services appropriate for all students in secondary schools. These services would be career oriented and concerned with the values, interests, and aptitudes of students, regardless of their post-secondary plans and would be integrated with current Board services to secondary school students." Note carefully the three phrases: "all students," "career oriented," and "regardless of post-secondary school plans."

Administratively, if PPRD is to be the College Board's vehicle for planning the future, care must be exercised to insure minority input to its deliberations. The further evolution of existing College Board programs and the development of new ones must take account of minority con-

20. A Report on Programs: 1975 Regional Assembly Meetings. Unpublished paper (College Entrance Examination Board), January 1975.
21. Ibid., p. 4.

cerns. The College Board must more effectively and fully exploit services already in place in order to promote educational opportunities--for instance, by explaining how data already being gathered can be used to describe opportunities and by impressing upon those who make decisions how such information can be interpreted positively so as to afford greater opportunities of this kind. As already suggested, for example, the Admissions Testing Program data system, including the Student Search Service could be much more fully utilized for such purposes.

With respect to the more effective utilization of testing per se within existing programs, the College Board recognizes that the measurement of academic aptitude and achievement represents only one dimension of an individual's capacity for growth and education in the broadest understanding of that term. The College Board further recognizes that any system of distributing or rationing educational opportunity with this dimension of measurement as the sole or principal criterion is neither educationally nor socially defensible. The association should therefore commit itself in the future to continued research on and the further development of other measurements or ways of appraising individuals in relation to educational opportunities that will enhance the fruitfulness of the educational process both for the individual and for society. Since there are aspects of the individual's worth, personality, and dignity that are not, or ought not, to be subject to measurement, the College Board should further acknowledge its continuing responsibility to promote educational opportunity in the services it renders to individuals and institutions as a basic individual right and aspiration.

With respect to the development of new programs at the College Board, the concept of career education has been introduced as a new organizing principle. President Marland perceives it as an opportunity for reform. His seminal book on the topic is in fact called Career Education: A Proposal for Reform. If the nation's minorities want change, as indeed they do, President Marland's concept is relevant. He speaks to the connection in his "Introduction":

"A large idea seems to need the cumulative thrust of other forces at a moment in time to make its way into general acceptance. Some of the forces that have lifted career education to a place of professional and public interest . . . include the widely recognized need for our schools

and colleges to regain their historically high level of public trust and respect, which has diminished in recent years; to provide more meaningful educational offerings for young people and adults, in response to their individual needs and aspirations, as distinct from solely institutional expectations; to remove the destructive effects of the isolation of academic learning from occupational development and real world experiences, a schism which American education has allowed to fester for so long; to concern ourselves as a society with the development of people in all their facets, practical as well as intellectual, and to honor good work of any kind; to redress the aimlessness of many college-going young people, and correspondingly to redress the enormous waste of human energy reflected in the high dropout and unemployed populations among our youth. One could go on citing the numerous forces coming into confluence in the mid-seventies which ask for change in our educational institutions. Not the least pressing is the search for the elusive solution to educating our disadvantaged and illiterate citizens. Work itself, and contemporary American attitudes toward work, have become an increasingly challenging social issue, commanding the sober attention of educators, social scientists, labor and industry leaders. Our commitment to "equality of opportunity," long a platitude, has begun to take on urgent meaning for women, minority citizens, and handicapped--and the nation is looking to our schools and colleges for solutions."[22] And, one might now reasonably add, to the College Board itself.

Speaking later to the criticism that "Blacks and other minorities are threatened by what might become 'tracking'" he argues:

"The absolute opposite direction is intended by those of us who helped advance the theory. The unhappy record of our society's ineffectiveness in elevating minority people to a position of equity in employment is well known. It is a disgrace. If we treat the subject of employment alone (and career education addresses many other topics) we must face the fact that unemployment rates for Blacks are twice those of the total population at about 11 percent, and for Black females it is worse.

"The hasty reader of our career education philosophy fails to take ac-

22. Sidney P. Marland, Career Education: A Proposal for Reform. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974, pp. xi-xii.

count of our hope that elementary and secondary education will, finally, be meaningful and useful to those who now are finding it irrelevant. They leave the system in large numbers, without pride or purpose or salable skills. This condition is not, by any means, limited to minority young people, but it affects them in more than ordinary degree. Career education, while in no way focused especially toward the minority student, has a particular meaning. It seeks to give a sense of control over the ultimate personal goals for its learner with corresponding expectations for motivation in basic studies, and it asks that every learner be equipped upon leaving the system to enter productive work. Both of these conditions of career education have immediate and affirmative values for the minority student, including the implications for more promising access to post-secondary education."[23]

Put in somewhat different terms, some minority observers suggest two possibilities. The first is that, despite the good intentions of its leaders, the career education movement can be and indeed is being used by others to put the minorities back in their place--that is, on a strictly vocational track presumed to be more compatible with their (the minorities') assumed (by those same "others") lesser academic ability; these observers fear that career education may only mean vocational education. Another fear is that career education, as an infusion into rather than an addition to existing programs, is bound to divert dollars away from the substance of those traditional academic offerings that have helped to give the majority the advantage it now enjoys. On both counts, the College Board must do all it can to insure that these unintended outcomes do not occur and that the goals of the career education leaders are pursued. On the latter score, the Board must try to assure that the changes its activities help bring about in the secondary school curriculum in the name of career education have the effect of minimizing and not increasing the disadvantage at which young people who are ethnically and culturally different from the majority operate in the educational process. And again on the subject of tracking, the College Board must seek to insure that its activities in the career education area generally, and in the development of decision-making skills in particular, take full account of the need to

23. Marland, op. cit., pp. 114-115. [Emphasis added.]

increase the representation of minority youth at all levels and in all aspects of postsecondary education and to bring that representation into parity with that of the majority.

At the same time, not all of the reaction to the career education movement from the minority community is negative. For instance, in its draft "Summary Report" on "Recommendations for New Delivery Systems" dated January 1975, the Task Force on the Disadvantaged and Post-secondary Education calls for the development of programs to assist disadvantaged students in realizing their options for postsecondary education and suggests that these programs might provide services related to "career choice," "post-secondary choice," "expanded experience," and "work/intern experience." More specifically the Task Force recommends the establishment of "service-learning centers" which would make available, among other benefits, "counseling related to . . . career choice [and] graduate and professional school options and calls attention to the need to develop functional and relevant counseling materials related to the disadvantaged and job or career opportunities following post-secondary education." Thus career education has its followers as well as its detractors among the nation's minorities.

Part of the confusion in relating career education to the interests of minority students is of course that there are many different interpretations given to the concept and the critics, including those within the minority communities, can choose to attack whichever meaning best suits their purposes. Although President Marland has himself avoided a specific definition of career education on the grounds that it is an evolutionary reform requiring evolutionary descriptions, he does end his chapter, "Toward a Definition of Career Education," with the following:

"A significant move toward consensus in the definition of career education is unfolding during the summer of 1974. The Chief State School Officers, assembled in Washington on June 13, 1974, accepted a report from its Committee for Career Education in which the following statement was ratified, including the tentative definition:

"'A Definition. The Committee is cognizant of the need for operational definitions of Career Education to be developed within and by the individual states. The Committee is of the opinion, however, that the Council should adopt, as a base, some type of functional definition into which

state definitions might fit.

"'It is therefore recommended that the Council adopt, or indicate its agreement with, the following tentative definition of Career Education.

"'Career Education is essentially an instructional strategy, aimed at improving educational outcomes by relating teaching and learning activities to the concept of career development. Career Education extends the academic world to the world of work. In scope, Career Education encompasses educational experiences beginning with early childhood and continuing throughout the individual's productive life. A complete program of Career Education includes awareness of self, and the world of work, broad orientation to occupations (professional and nonprofessional), in-depth exploration of selected clusters, career preparation, and understanding of the economic system of which jobs are a part, and placement for all students.'"[24]

It is obvious that President Marland takes a broad view of career education and that the College Board's approach to the development of activities will not be a narrow one. At the same time, if career education constitutes, among other things, a bridge between the worlds of education and of work, the College Board must do all it can to ensure that passage back and forth across it is open to the nation's minorities as well as to its majority.

As suggested elsewhere in this report, the following efforts, among others, should be undertaken. Career education comprehends skills different from those traditionally required for academic achievement and the College Board should continue its search for new measures to assess these skills. Scholastic and career success are not synonymous, and although the relationship between test performance and scholastic success has been studied, the relevance of test performance to career success has not been--and should be. The College Board's decision-making services have important contributions to make in career education, and in their adaptation to the new organizing principle the special problems faced by minority youth should be kept specifically in mind.

24. Marland, op. cit., pp. 105-106.

Summary of Suggested Actions for the Future

The conclusions or suggested actions for the future that are contained in the body of this report are reordered and restated below according to five major categories: explicit activities that should be continued or undertaken; explicit needs to which the College Board should make pragmatic response; explicit activities that should be deemphasized; general activities in which minority interests should be kept in the forefront of staff thinking; areas in which the College Board has a social responsibility to support the interests of minority youth.

EXPLICIT ACTIVITIES THAT SHOULD BE CONTINUED OR UNDERTAKEN

1. The several fee-waiver programs, particularly for the Admissions Testing Program, should be continued and expanded wherever possible.

2. The use and offer of use of the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test as a talent search device should be continued.

3. Efforts to insure that tests are administered in environments not hostile to minority youth should be continued.

4. The Minority Consulting Service should be continued.

5. Renewed emphasis should be placed on the development of new measures of human assessment, particularly in connection with career education.

6. Renewed emphasis should be placed on efforts to eliminate content or item bias in the College Board's tests.

7. Renewed emphasis should be placed on the search for criteria other than freshman grades against which to validate the College Board's tests.

8. Efforts should be renewed to put the College Board's experience in Puerto Rico with testing Spanish-speaking students to more effective use on the continent.

9. New efforts should be undertaken to deal with the disadvantages at which students from bilingual backgrounds operate in the educational process.

EXPLICIT NEEDS TO WHICH THE COLLEGE BOARD SHOULD MAKE PRAGMATIC RESPONSES

1. The need for specialized forums from time to time should be recognized and ad hoc committees or focused colloquiums should be sponsored to meet such needs.

2. The need for specialized training programs to deal with certain areas of the school-college and school-career transitions or with the needs of certain minority populations should be recognized and met wherever possible.

3. The desirability of responding favorably to external initiatives calling for College Board sponsorship of minority scholarship programs should be recognized, but the College Board itself should not seek to establish or fund such programs.

EXPLICIT ACTIVITIES THAT SHOULD BE DEEMPHASIZED

1. Demonstration projects involving talent-search and guidance activities, particularly those involving students in the later high school years, should be deemphasized in favor of work with minority youth at earlier grade levels in connection with career education activities.

2. Research on the limited issue of predictive validity of the College Board's tests for subgroups of candidates should be deemphasized in favor of more general research conducted in consultation with outside minority representatives.

3. Manipulating the CSS need analysis system should be recognized as an ineffective mechanism for dealing with the financial need of poor students

GENERAL ACTIVITIES IN WHICH MINORITY INTERESTS SHOULD BE KEPT IN THE FOREFRONT OF STAFF THINKING

1. In the conduct of its regular forums (annual and regional meetings, committee and council meetings, conferences and workshops, institutes and colloquiums), staff should be continually alert to the implications of the topics under consideration for minority youth.

2. In working with those people responsible for educational and training programs for secondary school counselors and college admissions and financial aid officers, College Board staff should continually alert them to give special attention to the interests of minority youth in designing their programs.

3. Staff responsible for College Board films and publications should be alert to the need to insure that those same interests are given adequate treatment by individual authors and through special pieces.

4. Staff responsible for the employment of others must continue to be alert to the absolute necessity of maintaining adequate minority representation on the College Board and ETS staffs.

5. Most important for the future, the work of the Program Planning and Research Division, as it plots the future course of the College Board, particularly in relation to career education, must keep the needs of the nation's minorities in the forefront of its thinking.

AREAS IN WHICH THE COLLEGE BOARD HAS A SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY TO SUPPORT THE INTERESTS OF MINORITY YOUTH

1. Care must be taken to adequately inform minority communities about the limitations of existing tests in general and about the relative imprecision or lack of absolutes in tests in particular.

2. Care must be taken to adequately inform the users of tests that overreliance on them can serve to exclude minority youth.

3. Every opportunity must be used to make the point that neither changes in existing tests nor the development of new ones alone can produce improvement in the educational lot of the nation's minority youth--and to stress the point that such improvements must be made if true equality of access to postsecondary study is to be achieved.

4. And every opportunity must be used to make the point that more financial aid--at the institutional, local, state, and federal levels--is also necessary if that equality is to become a reality.

5. In the meantime, it will be important to keep before the general public and our institutional constituency the need to adhere to the principle of awarding aid first to those who need it most.

6. And finally it should be reemphasized that because career education is perceived as the medium through which much needed educational reform can be achieved and because the absence of marked curricular improvement and change reflects one of the most formidable barriers to access to post-secondary education facing the nation's minority youth, the College Board should seek publicly to link and deal with these two imperatives as one.

Bibliography

Barriers to Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.

"ETS Guidelines for Testing Minorities." Unpublished paper, 1974.

Financing Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Interpreting the SAT Scores of the Educationally Disadvantaged Students. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Kendrick, S. A., "In Search of 'Non-Existent' Talent," College Board Review, No. 34, Winter, 1958, pp. 3-6.

Marland, Sidney P., Career Education: A Proposal for Reform. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Report on Programs: 1975 Regional Meetings. Unpublished paper, January 1975.

Task Force on the Disadvantaged and Post-secondary Education, Summary Report--Recommendations for New Delivery Systems. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1975.

The College Board Today. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975.

The Search for Talent. New York: The College Entrance Examination Board, 1960.

Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973.